DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 155 165 SP 012 796

AUTHOR Robbins, Jerry
TITLE Planning for Teacher Education in the '80's: Who Will Be the Gatekeeper?
PUB DATE Apr 78
NOTE 47p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accreditation (Institutions); *Governance; Higher Education; Policy Formation; *Preservice Education; Role Theory; Schools of Education; State Boards of Education; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Role; Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *National Education Association; *Organizational Role

ABSTRACT

The issue of control over entry into the teaching profession is discussed from the viewpoint of "the profession," i.e., the term used by the National Education Association (NEA) to describe its membership. "The profession" includes primarily classroom teachers in grades K-12, but rarely administrators or higher education personnel outside of professional education. Professors of education are also generally excluded in the use of the term. Within the issue of entry control, three matters of concern to "the profession" and to institutions of higher education (IHEs) are examined: accreditation, certification, and control over components of the undergraduate program. The importance of entry control to "the profession" is discussed in light of the present teacher surplus. The role of the NEA as a constituent member of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the gradual evolution of NCATE policy to reflect views of the NEA in regard to institutional accreditation are outlined. NEA activity in the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification and NEA development of a Model Teacher Standards and Licensure Act reflect involvement at the state level in teacher certification procedures. Proposals for control of key components of undergraduate teacher preparation programs, such as professional laboratory experiences, observation, and student teaching, represent NEA activity at the local level. The changing role of institutions of higher education (IHEs) and their constituent schools, colleges, and departments of education are discussed in relation to NEA pressures in the three areas of accreditation, certification, and program control; responses that IHEs might make to these NEA pressures are explored, and the consequences of these responses (combating, ignoring, capitalizing) are examined. (MJB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED155165

PLANNING FOR TEACHER EDUCATION IN THE '80's: WHO WILL BE THE GATEKEEPER?

by

Jerry Robbins, Dean
College of Education

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK

American Council on Education Fellow
in Academic Administration

GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

I. INTRODUCTION

In the early days of public elementary and secondary education in this country almost anyone who wanted to declare himself a "schoolmaster" could do so. The credentialing of teachers was all but unknown and the qualifications were often hardly above those of the pupils to be taught.

Gradually the licensing of teachers by local educational authorities became commonplace, often through the use of examinations covering the subject matter to be taught. It mattered little how the subject matter had been acquired.

In response to societal needs for better prepared teachers, the first of a number of "normal schools," with programs of varying length and quality, was established in 1839. As late

SP012 796

as 1900, though, these numbered only 127.[1] Summer "institutes" of a few days or a few weeks provided rudiments of methodology for some teachers. Gradually, chairs of pedagogy were established in prestigious institutions. Over a long period of time, the preparation of teachers became to be associated with formal education and institutions. Senior institutions assumed the responsibility for teaching not only the subject matter needed for the elementary and secondary schools but the corresponding methodology as well.

Gradually, the licensing of teachers through examination was abandoned; replaced with a system of state certification that was based primarily on completion of courses and degrees. In recent decades, the practice throughout the country has been for the state education agency to set certain standards, usually expressed in credit hours per subject, that must be included in a degree program by a prospective teacher. Under this arrangement, when the student presented evidence that he had completed the prescribed program of studies and other requirements, he was issued a certificate to teach certain subjects or at certain grade levels.

As teacher certification became primarily a matter of completion of courses and degrees, professors of education and other

---

[1]M.C. Cushman, The Governance of Teacher Education. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1977. P. 179.

college and university personnel became influential in determining what teachers needed to know. As certification became more degree- and course-based, schools, colleges, or departments of education (SCDEs) became well-established units in most senior institutions of higher education (IHEs).

Although teacher education programs have been included in the regional accreditation of institutions for many decades, the accreditation of teacher education programs per se dates from 1927 when the former American Association of Teachers Colleges initiated voluntary accreditation review procedures. When the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) was organized in 1948, responsibility for accreditation of teacher education was assumed by a committee of that association. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) was established in 1952, but it was not until 1954 that the AACTE turned the accrediting function over to NCATE. NCATE's first action was to extend accreditation to the 284 institutions that had previously been accredited by AACTE. NCATE was recognized in 1957 as the accreditation agency for teacher education.[2]

In the meantime, the National Association of Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) developed its own "Standards for State Approval of Teacher Education."

---

[2]Henry J. Hermanowicz, "The Present Status and Future of NCATE," Journal of Teacher Education, January-February, 1978. P. 33; Cushman, op. cit. Pp. 189-190

Thirty-five states belong to the NASDTEC reciprocity system. Under this arrangement, reciprocity privileges among the states are given to graduates of NCATE-accredited institutions.[3]

A number of states have incorporated NASDTEC "Standards" or variations of these standards into their state provisions for approval of programs leading to certification. Thus many teacher education programs meet both NCATE and state standards. The effect of all this is to create a sort of dual national accreditation system for teacher education. Although NCATE is by far the more widely known organization, Hermanowicz, immediate past president of AACTE holds that

> it appears that NASDTEC and the State Directors of Teacher Certification play a much more significant role as gatekeepers to the teaching profession by controlling program approval and licensure than NCATE has ever been able to play.[4]

Until fairly recently, NCATE was clearly under the domination of AACTE. In fact, prior to the adoption of the 1973 NCATE constitution, AACTE had the responsibility for revising standards. Thus it may be seen that through the late 1950's, the 1960's, and well into the 1970's accreditation and state certification were dominated or at least heavily influenced by higher education personnel, usually professors of education.

---

[3]Hermanowicz, op. cit. P. 37.

[4]Ibid.

During this period of time (and perhaps even now), according to Gubser, the in-coming director of NCATE, higher education institutions seemed "to accept the premise that admission to a teacher education program is tantamount to admission to the teaching profession."[5] This premise is losing its validity quickly, for the Instruction and Professional Development unit of the National Education Association (NEA) has stated, "It appears safe to say, however, that teachers are no longer content to let higher education 'own' teacher preparation. . . ."[6]

The shifting of control of entry to the teaching profession is described by Hermanowicz in this way:

> Earlier disputes centered upon the degree of control to be shared by liberal arts or other academic professors with professors of education. With the growing political militancy and concern of teacher organizations regarding matters of accreditation and certification, the controversy has shifted to the degree of shared control to be exercised by colleges and universities represented by AACTE and the organized teachers represented by the National Education Association (NEA).[7]

IHEs can no longer tolerate the internecine warfare between the liberal arts professors and the professors of education that has existed in many institutions. The external forces being brought on SCDEs and IHEs are now more important to the well

---

[5]Lyn Gubser, "Accrediting a Profession," Journal of Teacher Education, January-February, 1978. P.2.

[6]cited by Cushman, op. cit. P. 159.

[7]Hermanowicz, op. cit. P. 37.

being of each total institution than are the internal differences of opinion and philosophy.

Scope of the Paper

The principal group seeking to gain influence over entry to teaching is "the profession." This is the term used by the 1,886,000 member[8] National Education Association (NEA) to describe its membership and, in some contexts, others like its members. NEA membership is made up almost entirely of classroom teachers in grades K-12. Membership is now "unified," such that each NEA member is also a member of a state and a local affiliate. "The profession,"[9] as used by NEA, rarely includes administrators or higher education personnel outside of professional education.[10] Although a number of professors of education are members of NEA, this group is not usually included in the use of the term "the profession."

The American Federation of Teachers (AFT), AFL-CIO, is omitted from this discussion, not only because it is considerably smaller than NEA, but because it has traditionally been

---

[8]1975-1976 membership, which is undoubtedly higher now. There are about 2.4 million public and private elementary and secondary school teachers.

[9]or "the organized teaching profession" or "the united teaching profession."

[10]although, interestingly, NEA has been actively recruiting higher education faculty members in recent years.

primarily concerned with teacher welfare. With respect to preparation of teachers,

> The AFT is primarily concerned with the conditions under which classroom teachers take on the added responsibility for supervising student teachers, recognizing that student teaching is a most important phase of the professional preparation of the teacher. The AFT has been more concerned with the pre-service and in-service teacher education arrangements and opportunities than with such other aspects of governance as institutional curricula and licensure.[11]

Although "the profession" is very much concerned with the inservice training of teachers--and the implications of inservice training for IHEs are numerous--this paper will be limited to a consideration of the preservice preparation of teachers. Because there are many more agencies and organizations that claim an interest in inservice and/or graduate professional education, the forces on SCDEs and IHEs are much more complicated. Space does not permit an adequate discussion of these forces.

While there are a number of iwsues dealing with the preservice education of teachers that are of interest to both the higher education community and "the profession," the over-riding issue seems to be that of control over entry to the profession. Many of the other issues can be resulved once the wrestling over the control of entry is finished. As a result. this paper will be limited to a discussion of three matters closely related to

---

[11] Cushman, op. cit. P. 160

control over entry to the profession. These are of common interest to "the profession" and to IHEs: accreditation, certification, and key components of the undergraduate program.

In particular, there will be a discussion of the issue of control over entry to teaching from the point of view of "the profession." This will be followed by a discussion of the changing role of the SCDE and the present and potential conflicts between some SCDEs and the remainder of the institution of which they are a part. Finally, there will be a discussion of the alternatives that are available to IHEs and the possible consequences to the institutions of various courses of action.

II. CONTROL FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF "THE PROFESSION"

Leaders of "the profession" often take the position that the control of teacher education is out of control. During decade after decade of shortages of teachers, all preparation and certification structures were established such as to produce the largest possible number of somewhat qualified personnel for the elementary and secondary schools. Times have changed and the previous structures are highly inappropriate.

For one thing, there are now far too many teachers for the jobs available. SCDEs have few or no incentives to reduce enrollments and state education agencies generally have no

authority to refuse certification to a qualified applicant.

To illustrate, in 1974 the supply of elementary school teachers was 184.9 per cent of the demand for such teachers. At the same time the supply of secondary teachers was 230.2 per cent of the demand for teachers at that level.[12] Of 227,000 graduates in 1974-75, only 53 per cent of these are now working as a full-time teacher. Forty-three per cent have entered some other type of work, and four per cent are unemployed.[13] Data available since that time show that the situation is getting worse instead of better because of the declining enrollments at the K-12 levels.

Apparently word is getting around to the students about the difficulty of finding teaching positions. There were only 233,470 new teachers graduated in the spring of 1976, down 6.2 per cent from 1975 and down 29.6 per cent from a high of 317,254 in 1972. Even so, there were only 94,050 jobs available for the 185,850 persons who desired to enter teaching. At the same time, there were 117,000 former teachers who wanted to reenter the active profession.[14]

---

[12]Robert B. Howsam, Dean C. Corrigan, George W. Denemark, and Robert J. Nash, Report of the Bicentennial Commission on Education for the Profession of Teaching, Educating a Profession. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1976. Pp. 170-71.

[13]Legislative Briefs (AACTE), January, 1978. P. 3.

[14]From notes taken by the author at sessions of the convention of the AACTE, Chicago, Illinois, February 21-24, 1978.

Not only are there too many prospective teachers, thus threatening the job security and the rate of increase of salaries of existing teachers, but the quality of the preparation programs leaves much to be desired. SCDEs have been described as "incredibly diverse."[15] A recent study found that quality control is so weak that 93 of the 1367 SCDEs in the United States are operating in IHEs which cannot be accredited by their regional accrediting organizations as baccalaureate degree-granting colleges.[16] Only 540 of the 1367 state-approved teacher education programs are also NCATE accredited.[17]

The leaders of "the profession" often look to other established professions for models of control. They often conclude that the practitioners of other professions have much more control over who will enter their profession than teachers do to theirs.

Leaders in "the profession" also like to point to such contrasts as the fact that, in 1971, there were 85 accredited medical schools, 143 accredited law schools, 298 engineering schools, and 1246 teacher education programs. In 1968-69 these

---

[15]Egon G. Guba and David L. Clark, Are Schools of Education Languishing?" New York University Education Quarterly, Winter, 1978. P. 13.

[16]Ibid. P. 14

[17]Hermanowicz, op. cit. P. 33.

schools produced 8082 physicians, 17,308 lawyers, 60,173 engineers, and 229,500 teachers.[18]

Obviously, to "the profession," one of the major causes of the teacher surplus is that almost three-fourths of the senior IHEs in the country prepare teachers and this is seen to be too many preparation programs. In terms of teacher welfare, "the profession" sees an inverse relationship between the number of preparing institutions and the number of practitioners on the one hand and salaries and status on the other hand.

"The profession" concludes that both IHEs and state education agencies are permitting too many institutions to prepare too many teachers and than much of the quality is questionable. Therefore, mechanisms dominated by members of "the profession" must be established in order to control the number and quality of persons entering the field of elementary and secondary school teaching. The major mechanisms being used by the profession to accomplish this are control of the accreditation process (national level), control of the certification process (state level), and control of key components of the undergraduate preparation program (local level).

---

[18]J. Myron Atkin, "Governmental Roles" in Donald J. McCarty and Associates, New Perspectives on Teacher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973. Chapter 6.

Control of the Accreditation Process

NEA has been a constituent member of NCATE since its founding. As a matter of policy, as adopted by the 1976 Representative Assembly, NEA supports a single national non-governmental agency for the accreditation of teacher education. This agency must be "broadly representative of the teaching profession" and must include both "students preparing to teach" and "equitable representation" of K-12 teachers in all matters of policy and function.

However, NCATE has not in the past (and probably does not yet) fit NEA's model of an ideal accrediting agency. As a result, NEA has worked hard to get modifications made in the NCATE structure. In many ways the NEA efforts have been quite successful. To illustrate,

> Accreditation as a political system had a fairly stable character from the founding of NCATE in 1954 until 1972, when the NEA proposed to withdraw its $45,000 annual support from NCATE operations. The reason given was insufficient NEA representation. . .on the NCATE council . . . . The political process operated during the ensuing two or three years. . . . Out of the process came the output--a new constitution for NCATE. . . . It is quite clear that the pendulum of control has swung to the side of the teachers. . . .[19]

Accreditation control has been a major NEA conern in recent years. AACTE, once the dominant force in NCATE, has now been

---

[19]Cushman, op. cit. P. 229.

reduced to equal voting strength with NEA in NCATE. In 1977, NEA reported as part of its activities the

development of strategies to achieve the following:

1. Teacher representation at all levels of the accreditation process.
2. Elimination of ineffective teacher education programs through mandatory national accreditation.
3. Increased recognition for NCATE-accredited institutions.
4. Increased representation of constituents on visiting and evaluation teams.[20]

NEA has reported these recent accomplishments toward control of the accreditation process:

1. NEA has provided four training sessions for 225 NEA members to prepare them to serve on accreditation teams.

2. There has been a "significant increase" in denial of accreditation to those institutions that do not meet standards.

3. At least one-third of all members of NCATE committees must be NEA members.

4. Thirty-five per cent of all evaluation boards (now being discontinued) must be composed of teachers identified by NEA.

5. The Council of Chief State School Officers (a constituent member of NCATE, and one of a group of organizations that provides the "swing vote" on many issues) sends written communications to

---

[20]National Education Association, Educational Issues 1977. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1977. P. 51.

superintendents recommending released time for teachers to serve on NCATE committees and boards.

6. There has been a "marked increase" in the number of teachers serving as chairperson or vice chairperson of evaluation teams.[21]

Indeed, visiting teams in the spring of 1977 were composed of 21 per cent classroom teachers and 45 per cent K-12 personnel. In the spring of 1977 evaluation boards were composed of 25 per cent classroom teachers and 33.3 per cent K-12 personnel.[22]

Control of the Certification Process

Certification of teachers probably started in 1794 when the Society of Associated Teachers was organized in New York City. This society examined aspiring teachers and certified those they found worthy. Thus, certification at that time was by "the profession."[23]

However, very early in the history of the state education agencies, many of which were formed during the early 19th century, the legislature of each state usually assigned to the agency (or to the chief state school officer) the responsibility

---

[21] Ibid.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Cushman, op. cit. P. 142.

"to oversee the initial certification of teachers. . . ."[24] Through the years, according to Cushman, even a "casual view" of teacher certification shows that the impact of the fifty state education agencies has been great. The obvious reason is that traditionally the state education agency, under authority granted to it by the legislature, has been the legal agency for licensing all teachers. In addition, the teacher certification office in the state education agency usually approves the teacher education programs and the institutions providing the programs, often in a manner not unlike the procedures used by NCATE.[25]

From its beginning early in this century, one of the influential groups dealing with teacher certification has been the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC). Between 1950 and 1952 this organization developed its first proposed minimum standards for state approval of teacher preparation programs.[26]

NEA has promoted the development of advisory groups to the state education agencies and their certification offices. This is recognized in the 1971 edition of the NASDTEC guidelines

---

[24] Ibid.

[25] Ibid. P. 141.

[26] Ibid. P. 143.

where it is stated that it is "appropriate and desirable" for the state education agency "to seek the advice, counsel, and assistance of an advisory group or groups, representing as nearly as possible a cross-section of all segments of the education profession. . . ."[27]

However, NEA holds that merely advising the state education agency on certification matters is not nearly enough of a role for "the profession." In the very early 1970's, NEA studied the licensure of selected other occupational groups, namely accounting, dentistry, medicine, law, nursing, engineering, and architecture. NEA found that in practically all of these professions the initial licensure is made by an agency of the profession that has some legal sanction. However, the policies of licensure in education, although administered by professionals in state education agencies, was at that time determined "by one or both of two lay agencies: the state legislature or the state board of public school education." NEA then took the position that "the responsibility for shaping such policies /should/ be transferred to an autonomous commission of professionals sanctioned by legislative act."[28]

In particular, NEA established the following goal:

---

[27] Ibid. Pp. 143-144.

[28] Ibid. P. 153.

> We want a teaching profession act in every state, created by law. That act should give to members of the profession the legal power to: establish requirements for teaching certificates and to issue certificates; to determine and establish the procedures to be used in deciding which institutions of higher education are qualified to prepare teachers (accreditation). . .; to define performance criteria for teachers for both beginning and later-career roles. . .; to adopt rules and regulations to implement the teaching profession act. . . .
>
> The Teaching Profession Act in each state should provide for the selection, by their peers in education, of a number of professionals who will serve on a standards board and/or a practices commission which will have legal power to carry out the above duties.[29]

Out of this action came the "1971 Model Teacher Standards and Licensure Act" to control certification by the profession.[30] Variations on this model act have been proposed in a number of states by NEA state affiliates. However, in only two states, California and Oregon, do the boards so established have full legal powers. Nine other state have boards that meet NEA criteria for "standards and licensure" or "standards and practices" commissions or boards created by legislative act to be advisory to the state board of education. Twelve additional states have a "practices commission" only, an agency created by legislative

---

[29]National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, "Governance for the Profession." Working paper #1. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1970. Pp. 7-8.

[30]Howsam, et al., op. cit. P. 69.

act to be advisory to the state board of education.[31]

The NEA's Division of Instruction and Professional Development (IPD) "identifies the following states as being 'targets' for professional practices legislation in 1978: Florida, Idaho, Michigan,[32] Texas,[33] Vermont, and Virginia."[34] In addition, Iowa and Minnesota[35] are states where "modification to existing legislation" is slated.[36]

Control of Key Components of the Undergraduate Program

"The profession" seeks to exert its influence not only at the national and state levels, but at the local level as well. In many instances,

> teachers in the local school district are the extension of the National Education Association, and since the local school district provides most of the professional laboratory experiences, observation, and student teaching, it occupies a critical position as a governance

---

[31]Cushman, op. cit. P. 159.

[32]A professional standards and licensing commission bill is deadlocked in committee, according to the AACTE. (April, 1978)

[33]AACTE expects passage in the 1978 session of an autonomous commission on standards for the teaching profession.

[34]A bill was defeated in the last session of the General Assembly, according to the AACTE. (April, 1978)

[35]The state has had since 1973 a board of teaching which submits recommendations to the state board of education, which may respond but not initiate its own rules.

[36]Russell B. Vlaanderen, "State Review: Competency-Based Teacher Certification and Professional Practices," Legislative Briefs (AACTE), March, 1978, P. 5.

mechanism.[37]

Among the areas in which NEA has urged its local affiliates to take action are these:

> . . .(b) Critically assess current college and university programs of teacher education and make specific recommendations for change.
>
> (c) Support inclusion of training in the dynamics of intergroup communications and human relations courses in requirements for certification. . . .
>
> (e) Develop guidelines for qualifications of. . . college coordinators of student teachers.
>
> (f) Support inclusion of instruction in school law and in the values, ethics, responsibilities, and structure of professional teachers organizations. . . .
>
> (g) Support the teaching of methods courses by teachers currently employed in elementary and secondary schools.
>
> (h) Support requirements in state certification requirements for specific course work in reading instruction. . . .
>
> (j) Recommend SNEA membership before participation in preprofessional experiences and student teaching.
>
> (k) Take immediate steps to improve the selection of persons entering the profession through more effective screening of applicants for the preprofessional practicum.[38]

NEA proposes a mechanism for accomplishing these objectives when it supports "inclusion in master contracts or school

---

[37]Cushman, op. cit. P. 161.

[38]National Education Association, NEA Handbook. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1976. P. 213.

policies that acceptance of student teachers be on a voluntary basis."[39] Thus it appears that the master contract between the school district and the local NEA affiliate may become extremely important in matters affecting preservice education and employment opportunities.

III. THE CHANGING ROLE OF THE SCDE

It is obvious that the role of the SCDE and of its faculty is changing. NEA would obviously like to have the SCDEs and the professors of education closely aligned with it and its interests. Many IHEs would resist this move, in whole or in part.

Even the leaders among teacher educators are not always in agreement as to the desirable direction for SCDEs to follow. For example, in speaking of the recent activities of "the profession" toward greater influence in teacher preparation, Ted Cyphert found that

> The focus is on self-interested control of accreditation, vested self-interest control of teacher evaluation, and self-serving community involvement in policy formation. . . . This emphasis on the political and the parochial is coupled with a strong trend in the direction of egalitarianism; that is, a condition in which numbers rather than knowledge, and power rather than expertise, are

---

[39] Ibid. P. 214.

the basis on which decisions are made.[40]

On the other hand, AACTE's Bicentennial Commission on Education for the Profession of Teaching recommended that states develop means by which the organized teacher profession can be delegated responsibility for establishing standards, for certification, and for professional behavior.[41]

Should the professors of education be more closely aligned with "the profession" than they typically are now? Let us look at some of the pressures that are being brought to make a closer alignment come about.

Pressures Through the Accreditation Process

NCATE has issued new standards, to be effective January 1, 1979. The influence of NEA positions may be seen in several of the standards, although the positions were diluted considerably from the drafts of the revisions to the standards.-

The preface to the 1979 NCATE Standards includes the statement

> These standards are considered so important for program accreditation that they may take precedence over

---

[40]Ted Cyphert, "The Role of the Teaching Profession in Teacher Education," in Frank Klassen and Howard B. Leavitt (eds.), International Perspectives of Teacher Education: Innovations and Trends. Washington, D.C.: International Council on Education for Teaching, 1976. P. 116.

[41]Howsam, et al., op. cit.

> any factors or conditions that may impinge upon their application.[42]

The meaning of this statement in operational terms remains to be seen. There is speculation that the operational meaning of it is something to the effect that there will be no excuses for falling short on any standard, even though there might be a compensating strength somewhere else. If this is the case, it puts far more "teeth" into some of the standards than has been the case in the past, and IHEs (and certainly SCDEs) will need to make sure that they are in full compliance with all standards.

Standard 1, which has been elevated to new prominence in the 1979 edition, identifies the policy-making group for teacher education programs within the IHE in this way:

> The design, approval, and continuous evaluation and development of teacher education programs are the primary responsibility of an officially designated unit. . . . A majority of the membership of this unit are experienced in elementary or secondary teaching and have continuing experiences in elementary or secondary schools.[43]

Obviously, the intent of this standard is to put control of each IHE's teacher education program in the hands of those who, if not now members of "the profession" at least have been members

---

[42]National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: The Council. Effective January 1, 1979. (n.p., iii?)

[43]Ibid. P. 3.

of (or eligible for membership in) "the profession" in the past. Some institutions have clearly delegated this matter to the SCDE; many other institutions, though, fall short of the interpretation of this standard that will probably be given to it by NCATE visiting teams. Through the threat of withholding accreditation, institutions[44] are being pressured to grant more autonomy to the professors of education, the group of persons on each campus most likely to be sympathetic to the concerns of "the profession."

There is a counter-force to this pressure on many campuses, often coming primarily from faculty and administrators with an arts and sciences orientation. It is largely a "philosophical" argument, stemming usually from the position that much of professional education is irrelevant (or perhaps even detrimental) to the making of a good teacher. Therefore, it would be undesirable to the cause of producing learned teachers to let those who advocate irrelevancies (the professors of education) have the dominant role in determining how teachers shall be prepared.

NCATE Standard 2.5 is not new, but it may take on new importance. This standard calls for student participation in program development, evaluation, and revision. Lip service to

---

[44]It is not always clearly understood that NCATE accredits an institution, not a SCDE. Thus NCATE pressures are being brought against the entire institution, although the SCDE and the professors of education usually feel the brunt of the pressure.

student participation has been paid for a number of years. For example, ten years ago NEA established that

> The development of greater student participation in the decision-making process of teacher education must be based upon a consensus by all elements of the teacher education community that student involvement is important enough to be considered part of the total democratic and educational process of the institution, and that it is compatible with the purposes of the university community.[45]

Although there has been a commitment to student participation in program development on many campuses, it has only been in recent months that students have been included on NCATE visiting teams.[46] This has come about partly because of the stepped-up involvement of the Student National Education Association (SNEA), a branch of the NEA, in NCATE matters. It is only reasonable to expect that visiting teams, now having a student member, will look more closely at the nature and extent of student participation in teacher education policy than has been the case in the past.

Politically, greater student involvement will probably

---

[45]National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, "Guidelines for Establishing Greater Student Voice in Teacher Education Through a Student-Faculty Committee." 1968. ED 028 132

[46]The University of Arkansas at Little Rock was among the early institutions to have a student member of the visiting team. Later, the Student National Education Association used UALR as a training site to prepare students to be team members.

have the effect of moving the SCDEs closer to the positions of "the profession," because on many issues the students are more likely to support the views of "the profession" than they are to support the views traditionally held by the professors of education.

Counteracting this position on many campuses will be the reluctance of many faculty members (including some professors of education) to take student opinion on teacher education matters very seriously, usually on the grounds that the students are immature, inexperienced, and relatively uneducated. Because students have these deficiencies relative to the experiences of the faculty, the students are perceived to be generally incapable of seeing "the big picture." Therefore, there is little or no point in bothering either the students or the faculty with students' uninformed and unenlightened opinions.

NCATE Standards 3.1 and 3.2 speak as previously to the qualifications of faculty members teaching professional education courses. There is increased emphasis on "involvement with schools," an attempt, obviously, to ensure that professors of education are in touch with the reality that their students will face on the job. From a political point of view, of course, it is likely that the greater the contact between the professors of education and the teachers in the field, the more the professors will accept and support the points of

view of "the profession." It is also possible that "involvement with schools" may come to mean, in part, "involvement with teacher associations."

There may be a powerful counteracting force in many IHEs. In order to maintain the necessary close involvement with schools, professors of education may have to spend much time and energy in activities that traditionally have not been highly prized for promotion, tenure, etc. Further, the time spent in close involvement with schools may drastically reduce the amount of time available to be spent in scholarly productivity. As a result, campus-wide faculty groups and central administrators who make decisions on faculty rewards are not likely to see documented the same type of non-teaching activity from professors of education as they would ordinarily see documented from, say, professors of English or history. If professors of education are held to the same standards of scholarly productivity as the rest of the campus, the professors will be in a dilemma.

Other standards (one of which is completely new), new wording, and new interpretations may also contribute to moving the thinking of the SCDEs closer to that of "the profession." However, the items given above should suffice to illustrate the pressures to move the SCDEs closer to the position of "the profession" than they now are.

NEA does not seem to consider professors of education part of "the profession" and it would apparently prefer to see methods courses and student teaching handled mostly or entirely by members of "the profession." As a second best arrangement, NEA would obviously like to see the control of teacher education programs at each IHE in the hands of "experienced" elementary and secondary school teachers (who are now professors) who maintain their "involvement with schools."

Pressures Through the Certification Process

Formal and elaborate "program approval" procedures by the state education agency are becoming operational in many states. In effect, graduates of approved teacher education programs are eligible for certification as teachers by the state; others are not. Often, programs are approved only after an on-site visit by personnel representing the state education agency. Some states have written their own criteria; more often, the criteria are, or are similar to, the NASDTEC "Standards for State Approval of Teacher Education."

Among the factors that apply to all programs, under the NASDTEC Standards, is one that deals with the governance of teacher education in each IHE. This is stated more explicitly in the NASDTEC Standards than in the NCATE Standard on Governance, in that it specifies that a particular administrative unit must be given certain responsibilities.

> Institutions which accept responsibility for education of teachers should establish and designate the appropriate division, school, college, or department within the institution charged with accountability and authorization to act, within the framework of general institutional policy, on all matters relative to the teacher education program.[47]

In almost all cases, the unit to be designated would be the SCDE. The effect, in terms of pressures, would be similar to that described earlier in connection with NCATE Standard 1.[48]

Professional licensing boards, state boards of education, and even legislatures structure part or all of the professional preparation programs for teachers. The requirements tend to increase over time, and it usually comes as no surprise when the appropriate state body (-ies) determines that something else should be added to the curriculum for the preparation of teachers.

---

[47]National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, "Revisions of 1971 Edition, Standards for State Approval of Teacher Education." Salt Lake City, Utah: Utah State Board of Education, 1972. (Mimeographed). Pp. 7-8.

[48]Arts-and-sciences oriented professors and administrators sometimes take the position that certification is largely irrelevant, except as some insurance that the prospective teacher knows his subject matter before going into the classroom. But even this is really unnecessary, the argument goes, because his knowledge of subject matter is shown by his courses and grades on his transcript (except in education courses, where almost everyone, regardless of how incompetent, seems to get good grades), so there really isn't any important function served by certification.

When such matters arise, a problem is created for many SCDEs. In many institutions any curricular change must be approved by some campus-wide body in which representation from the SCDE is in the minority. In such cases, it is not unusual to see vast amounts of faculty time and energy spent in debating the merits of the proposed change before the approving group (often grudgingly) approves what has been mandated by the state authorities. The lack of autonomy to deal with such matters tends to push professors of education in the direction of seeking more autonomy for the SCDE.

Pressures Through Key Components of the Undergraduate Program

SCDEs are usually dependent on elementary and secondary schools for placements in observation, student teaching, and other field experiences. It is likely that master contracts negotiated between school boards and the local affiliate of the NEA (or perhaps other teacher organizations) will begin to contain provisions such as these:

1. Only a certain number of student teachers[49] will be accepted each year.
2. Only those student teachers from certain "cooperative" IHEs will be accepted.
3. Only those student teachers will be accepted who have been taught "the values, ethics, responsibilities, and structure of professional teacher organizations."

---

[49]"Student teachers" could be expanded to include students who are observing, participating in a preprofessional laboratory, serving as as a teacher aide, or in some other structured field experience.

4. Only those student teachers who are members of the SNEA will be accepted.

5. Only those student teachers who have had certain courses outside of those required for certification (teaching of reading, human relations, etc.) will be accepted.

6. Only those student teachers will be accepted who have been screened on certain specified criteria.

7. Only those student teachers will be accepted who have been taught their methods courses by a member of "the profession."

8. Only those student teachers will be accepted whose college supervisor is a member of the NEA.

An SCDE that found itself with one such arrangement in its service area might be only inconvenienced in its placement of students for field experiences. However, if there were several such agreements in key places, the SCDE might find that it had no choice but to comply. The political effect of this is, of course, to bring the SCDE into much closer contact with "the profession."

Countering this move within the IHE would be the outcry--brought by a number of faculty members, probably including some of the professors of education--that the institution was being subjected to "academic blackmail." This would be the case particularly if the conditions that were imposed appeared to be self serving to "the profession." Undoubtedly there would be a quick search for alternatives to placing students in school districts that imposed such conditions.

IV. ALTERNATIVES AVAILABLE TO IHEs

There are three basic responses available to IHEs with respect to the trends in control of teacher education. One of these is to work to reverse or counteract the trends. Another is to ignore the trend and make some response to it only when required and then only in the least possible way. A third possible response would be to capitalize on the trends to improve teacher education. Each of these will be discussed in turn.

Organize to Reverse or Counteract the Trend

It would be possible to organize IHEs in such a way that pressure could be brought to reverse, counter, or at least stabilize the trends. Existing organizations of higher education institutions could do this if sufficient numbers of the members of the organizations wished to do so.

Among the possible strategies would be these: (1) It might be possible to "recapture" NCATE from perceived NEA domination especially through the use of economic pressures. (2) Institutions could withdraw from NCATE, a particularly effective move if a group of large, prestigious, influential institutions were to do this simultaneously. This would have the effect of weakening NCATE to the extent that it was no longer a major force in teacher education. (3) Another approach would be to

organize or support some alternative accrediting structure(s) that is dominated by or more sympathetic to higher education interests.[50]

With respect to state certification of teachers, IHEs could organize political effort such as to eliminate "profession"-controlled boards where they exist and to prevent them from being created where they do not exist. IHEs could also organize political efforts to alter (usually reduce) certification requirements that have been established by legislative action or by state boards of education. IHEs could also organize activities such as to get IHE personnel selected (usually appointed) to influential positions in groups that determine certification items. It is at least theoretically possible in some instances that the IHE personnel could "capture" enough of the leadership positions of state teacher organizations to influence the organizations to take some different course of action.

IHEs could determine internal policies such that all institutional services would be withheld from school districts that imposed any conditions on field placements of students, hiring graduates of the institution, etc. Political pressure could also be brought to bear on school boards and super-

---

[50]The United States Office of Education, the Education Commission of the States, NASDTEC, subject-matter organizations, and state departments of education (and departments of higher education) have all been suggested.

intendents of schools to remove or re-negotiate any conditions that are placed on the IHEs' students or faculty. Similarly, the IHEs could devise a way to co-opt the leadership of state and local teacher organizations such that conditions were not sought or were removed.

It is difficult to predict the liklihood of these things happening. With respect to NCATE and accreditation, Hermanowicz has reported that

> Some organizations in higher education, including the Land-Grant University Deans of Education, are seriously discussing non-participation in NCATE since it is voluntary and some regard it as a losing cause. Other prestigious individual institutions such as Stanford University have withdrawn from voluntary NCATE participation.[51]

In most states, the association of colleges of teacher education has considerably less political clout than does the state NEA affiliate. It has been and continues to be difficult in many states to get all the IHEs well-organized to fight (or support) any single issue, other than perhaps something related to a legislative appropriation. As a result, although there may be scattered instances of IHE and SCDE political strategies being employed to deal with the issues that have been raised, political influence is not likely to be widely employed.

---

[51]Hermanowicz, op. cit. P. 37.

Ignore the Trends

Maintaining the status quo is often the easiest course of action, both for individuals and institutions. Many institutional leaders may not be deliberately ignoring what is happening outside their institutions in the field of teacher education, but they may be unaware of it. Indeed, one of the purposes of this paper is to call attention to trends with which the readers may not be familiar.

An institution could generally ignore the trends in matters related to accreditation and rationalize the action by positions such as these:

1. Accreditation visits occur infrequently; the requirements may change to our advantage between now and the time we must prepare for the next visit.
2. If we run into trouble on some point in our accreditation visit, we can always try to patch that up quickly in the final stages or try to exert pressure on the approving body to give us a clean slate.
3. The standards are vague. We can get by with almost anything by giving back to the visiting team the same sort of rhetoric that is in the standards. This can be particularly effective if we couple it with an outstanding job of hospitality to the visiting team.
4. What real difference does it make if we aren't accredited?

However, considering the positions that NEA has taken, it is quite likely that the number of institutions accredited by NCATE will be reduced. To the extent that an institution considers accreditation by NCATE valuable, the institution cannot afford

to ignore the changes in standards and the interpretation and emphasis that are now being given to the standards.

An institution could generally ignore the trends in matters related to certification and rationalize the action by positions such as these:

1. If some requirement is mandated by the state, we'll just tack it on to the existing requirements.
2. It is not likely that we would run into trouble, through program approval, with very many programs at a time. We can fix things up as we go along, one thing at a time.
3. Certification matters usually have their loopholes and appeal procedures that can be invoked while we patch up any matter that might present difficulty.

Nevertheless, certification matters should be taken more seriously than accreditation matters. For example, in an over-riding example--that of control--it would be dangerous to ignore the NASDTEC standard. Loss of accreditation may, in effect, be just a loss in prestige. Loss of access to certification means that the graduates of the institution would not be able to obtain teaching positions in public schools or to be paid from public funds.

It may be argued that, if it should become uncomfortable for the IHE to work with district X because of conditions that are imposed on field placements, qualifications of college supervisors, or hiring of graduates, there would always be

districts Y and Z to work with. If it becomes difficult to work with the public schools in the area, the argument goes, we can always place students in non-public schools, laboratory schools, special residential schools, and other such settings that are less likely to impose conditions than are the public school districts. Rationalizations such as these are easy to make when an IHE chooses to ignore the pressures of the local public school structure; they are much harder to carry out in practice by personnel in SCDEs.

Capitalize on the Trends and Use Them to Improve Teacher Education

To capitalize on the trends may be perceived by some as a "jumping on the bandwagon," a "running around to the front of the mob to be its leader," or even an "if you can't lick 'em, join 'em," strategy. But as Cushman has said,

> The ideal outcome is reconciliation and an amalgamation of the best of all ideas and proposed solutions. This is not only good political strategy, it is also in the academic tradition of the search for truth--or at least it is the best modus operandi.[52]

One only has to review the recent history to see that certain trends, at least for the near future, are rather well established. There is an inevitability to increased participation of K-12 teachers in decisions concerning the next generation of teachers. One interesting piece of research makes

---

[52]Cushman, op. cit. P. 232

the point even better.

Clark and Coutts in 1971 used the Delphi technique to determine the degree of consensus on the future of teacher education. The "experts" were forty chief administrative officers in Canadian English-language teacher education institutions. Panelists were given a list of projective statements and asked at what date they thought each statement would be descriptive of teacher education in Canada.

Teacher education institutions are here to stay, according to this research, for 80-89 per cent of the respondents believed that "never (but certainly not before the year 2000) will institutions devoted to the preparation of teachers disappear." About three-fourths of the respondents felt that "by 1980 teachers and teachers' organizations will share control of teacher education about equally with teacher education institutions in recruitment and selection of candidates." It was further found that "teachers and teachers' organizations will share control of teacher education about equally with teacher education institutions (a) by 1990 in determining the curriculum and procedures used in teacher education institutions and (b) by 1980 in determining which candidates have successfully completed the program and

warrant certification."[53]

Another factor pointing to the inevitability of increased influence of "the profession" is that the teacher education community, at least as reflected through the AACTE itself, holds that "states should develop means by which the organized teacher professon can be delegated responsibility for establishing standards, for certification, and for professional behavior."[54]

However, to capitalize on the trends and make use of them for the improvement of teacher education will require, in most instances, a greater degree of autonomy for SCDEs. As one author has put it,

> The governance of teacher education has been faulty precisely because the teacher education unit has not had the power to control its preparation program. Teacher education is an all-university function, but not an all-university responsibility; university senates, presidential staffs, and teacher education councils are not the agencies to determine policy. These agencies can be helpful in an advisory and participatory capacity, but final decisions on programs and standards are the responsibility of the college of education.[55]

---

[53]C.T. Clark and H.T. Coutts, "The Future of Teacher Education." Edmondton, Alberta: Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, 1971. ED 054 065

[54]Howsam, et al., op. cit. Ibid.

[55]Cushman, op. cit. Pp. 57-58.

With respect to accreditation by NCATE, it appears that maintaining accredited status by an IHE will be influenced heavily by the degree to which the "design, approval, and continuous evaluation and development" of teacher education programs is in the hands of the SCDE. At many institutions, this may mean some other individual or group giving up some authority; nevertheless, this seems essential if it is desired to remain accredited.

Continued accreditation will also be influenced heavily by the nature and extent to which students are involved in important decision-making settings. Given the job market situation, it would seem valid for students to influence programs such that they are prepared, not for what the faculty thinks the jobs ought to be, but for what will in fact help them obtain employement. Students, along with the faculty in education, may be in a much better position to make decisions about the real world of teaching than any other combination of persons on a campus.

Continued accreditation will also depend a great deal on the provision of appropriate faculty rewards--hiring, pay increases, promotion, tenure, etc.--for "involvement with schools" in place of, if necessary, more traditional scholarly activities. Administrators and appropriate faculty groups in SCDEs need to have high degrees of autonomy to deal with such

matters, rather than having such matters considered by the same persons or groups that make determinations of faculty rewards based on the traditional measures of scholarly activity.

Similarly, it is important for the SCDE to have a high degree of autonomy in working with the state agency responsible for establishing certification requirements and for the SCDE to have the authority to implement those requirements that have been cooperatively determined. It is preposterous to ask a campus-wide body to debate and approve a requirement that has been mandated by a state agency unless, of course, the institution desires to graduate uncertifiable "teachers" or abandon its teacher education program.

Further, it is important that the SCDE have the authority to negotiate with and conclude agreements with state and local teacher organizations and other agencies and organizations over the terms of field placements, school-based instruction programs, supervisory personnel, etc. Innovative multi-agency programs for the preparation of teachers will be difficult enough to accomplish under the best of circumstances; having the SCDE only as the "middle man" from the IHE will prevent a lot of desirable structures from being formed.

In short, and in conclusion,

The university governance structure and procedures should grant the same self-governance and freedom

> to the college of education as to other professional schools. . . . College of education responsibility and autonomy means that anyone, undergraduate or graduate, in preparation for a position in the public schools, should be registered in, advised by, and graduate from the college of education. The major role of the college of education is a coordinating one. It must have final responsibility, and commensurate authority, for seeking out and using all resources for teacher education programs, on the campus whereever they may be found--in other colleges, schools, and departments--and off the campus from such sources as the state, the local schools, accrediting agencies, federal agencies, foundations, the organized profession, the public, and the profession of teacher educators.[56]

Who will be the gatekeeper in the '80's? Not the colleges and universities, though they have enjoyed this role for many years, but the profession itself. If the SCDEs can effectively play the role of the training arm of the largest profession, they and the institutions of which they are a part will probably become more influential than ever before.

---

[56] Ibid. Pp. 89-90.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Atkin, J. Myron, "Governmental Roles." Chapter 6 in Donald J. McCarty and Associates, New Perspectives on Teacher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Burdin, Joel, "Editorial," Journal of Teacher Education, November-December, 1977. P. 2.

Bush, Robert N., "We Know How to Train Teachers: Why Not Do So!" Journal of Teacher Education, November-December, 1977. Pp. 5-9.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Continuity and Discontinuity--Higher Education and the Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

Cherniack, Mark et al., "Guidelines for a More Reality Based Teacher Preparation Program for the Future." ED 104 866

Clark, C.T. and H.T. Coutts, "The Future of Teacher Education." Edmondton, Alberta: Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, 1971. ED 054 065

Clark, David, "The Real World of the Teacher Educator: A Look to the Near Future." ED 134 566

_____ and Gerald Marker, "Institutionalization of Teacher Education." ED 099 328

Corrigan, Dean, "Educating a Profession: For What Purposes?" in Frank Klassen and Howard B. Leavitt (eds.), International Perspectives of Teacher Education: Innovations and Trends. Washington, D.C.: International Council on Education for Teaching, 1976.

Cote, Ron Roy, "The Next 25 Years: Long-Range Planning for the Development of Professional Education Programs 1976-2001." ED 123 703

Cunningham, Luvern L., "Effecting Reform in a College of Education." Chapter 10 in Donald J. McCarty and Associates, New Perspectives on Teacher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Cushman, M.C., The Governance of Teacher Education. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1977.

Cyphert, Ted, "The Role of the Teaching Profession in Teacher Education," in Frank Klassen and Howard B. Leavitt (eds.), International Perspectives of Teacher Education: Innovations and Trends. Washington, D.C.: International Council on Education for Teaching, 1976.

Epstein, Leon, "Liberal Arts Perspective." Chapter 14 in Donald J. McCarty and Associates, New Perspectives on Teacher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Goldhammer, Keith, "Premises and Context of Collegiate-Based Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, November-December, 1977. Pp. 10-14.

Guba, Egon G. and David L. Clark, "Are Schools of Education Languishing?" New York University Education Quarterly, Winter, 1978. Pp. 9-16.

Gubser, Lyn, "Accrediting a Profession," Journal of Teacher Education, January-February, 1978. P. 2.

Hermanowicz, Henry J., "The Present Status and Future of NCATE," Journal of Teacher Education, January-February, 1978. Pp. 33-37.

Howsam, Robert B., Dean C. Corrigan, George W. Denemark, and Robert J. Nash, Report of the Bicentennial Commission on Education for the Profession of Teaching, Educating a Profession. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1976.

Imig, David, "Alternatives for Schools of Education Confronted with Enrollment and Revenue Reductions." ED 099 309

Joyce, Bruce et al., "Reflections on Preservice Preparation: Impressions from the National Survey," Journal of Teacher Education, September-October, 1977. Pp. 14-15.

Koerner, James D., "Governance of Teacher Education." Chapter 8 in Donald J. McCarty and Associates, New Perspectives on Teacher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Legislative Briefs (AACTE). December, 1977; January, 1978; March, 1978.

Lincoln, Yvonna S. and Egon G. Guba, "Reward Systems and Emergent Missions: Higher Education's Dilemma," Phi Delta Kappan, March, 1978. Pp. 464-7.

Lindsey, Margaret, "Curricular Developments." Chapter 12 in Donald J. McCarty and Associates, New Perspectives on Teacher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

McCarty, Donald J. and Associates, New Perspectives on Teacher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, "Revisions of 1971 Edition, Standards for State Approval of Teacher Education." Salt Lake City, Utah: Utah State Board of Education, 1972. (Mimeographed).

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: The Council. Effective January 1, 1979.

National Education Association, Educational Issues 1977. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1977.

_____, NEA Handbook. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1976.

_____, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, "Governance for the Teaching Profession." Working paper #1. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1970.

_____, "Guidelines for Establishing Greater Student Voice in Teacher Education Through a Student-Faculty Committee," 1968. ED 028 132

Olson, Paul B., Director, Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, Teacher Education in the United States: The Responsibility Gap. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1976.

Shanker, Albert, "Professional Relationships: Reality and Action," Journal of Teacher Education, September-October, 1977. Pp. 8-10.

Sizer, Theodore R., "Teacher Education for the 1980's." Chapter 3 in Donald J. McCarty and Associates, New Perspectives on Teacher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Stiles, Lindley and Jack A. Bills, "National Accrediting," Chapter 9 in Donald J. McCarty and Associates, New Perspectives on Teacher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Van Til, William, "Scenarios for Education, Year 2000," Phi Delta Kappan, December, 1977. Pp. 275-6.

Vlaanderen, Russell B., "State Review: Competency-Based Teacher Certification and Professional Practice," Legislative Briefs (AACTE), March, 1978. Pp. 4-5.

The author brings a variety of perspectives to the subject of this paper. In addition to being dean of a college of education, and his institution's chief institutional representative to the AACTE, he is president of the Arkansas Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, a member of the AACTE's Advisory Council of State Representatives, and a member of the Board of Directors of the Teacher Education Council of State Colleges and Universities.

He is also president of the Department of Higher Education of the Arkansas Education Association, a life member of the National Education Association, and a member of the Board of Directors of the Arkansas Education Association.

Atlanta, Georgia
April, 1978

jr